

Salton Sea Authority RFP No. 15-01
Infrastructure Financing Feasibility Study
Response to Comments on the Draft RFP
June 3, 2015

Comment	Response
Comment Set 1	
1. The location, amount/type, and timing of private development to be evaluated in the study should be more clearly defined/limited. Are there focused locations within the communities along the shoreline? Is the consultant solely analyzing the potential for visitor-oriented development? Is the timeframe for development limited to the near- to mid-term -- e.g., say 5 to 10 years – or a much longer period?	The consultant will be expected to make recommendations on the location, amount/type, and timing of private development to be evaluated in the study as part of the inventory and survey tasks. No specific focused locations along the shoreline have been identified at this time. The timeline for Salton Sea restoration is longer than 5 to 10 years.
2. Are any potential development sites currently publicly owned? Should the consultant consider privately owned property as potential development sites?	Both types of sites should be considered.
3. To the extent that potential development sites are publicly owned, should the study address potential ground lease revenues or land sales proceeds from these sites?	There are no restrictions on the development-related sources of revenue that should be considered. The consultant should discuss any drawbacks and probability of success associated with whatever sources are identified.
4. Does the consultant need to prepare preliminary concept plans for potential development in one or more locations around the shoreline, e.g., range of market absorption forecasts?	Yes.
5. How many development scenarios should the consultant analyze?	The consultant may propose multiple options, but it would seem that low, moderate and high development options would be beneficial.
6. Will Tetra Tech be responsible for all cost estimation related to water-side improvements? Will this extend to site preparation and/or infrastructure improvements required for land-side development?	Tetra Tech will be responsible for cost estimation of improvements related to water-side, but not for infrastructure improvements required for land-side development.
7. How many development scenarios, and what development timeframe, will be addressed in the Socio-Economic Analysis? Will Tetra Tech provide delineated descriptions and cost estimates for all proposed public improvements? Can Tetra Tech provide a schedule of when portions of the shoreline are ready for water-related visitor development?	There is no approved project at this time. Tetra Tech is developing various restoration alternatives and components. The consultant will need to work with Tetra Tech and other stakeholders to determine the appropriate planning horizon.
8. The Additional Task is unclear, specifically “Authority’s recent analysis of potential financing options”. What document does this reference?	That section of the RFP has been modified to indicate that several previous investigations that were related to earlier

Comment	Response
	restoration planning and not the current restoration planning process will be provided the Consultant.
9. The scope of services should more specifically define expectations for the industry forum event. It may be difficult to attract relevant industry participants to a remote location for an in-person meeting.	There are no specific expectations at this time. The Consultant respond to the scope as written but may propose an alternate strategy.
10. The scope of services should identify a total number of meetings with the client organizations and stakeholder/community groups. Is there a target number of brokers/property owners to be surveyed?	The Consultant should plan for at least three meetings, generally these would include one in the Coachella Valley, one in the Imperial Valley, and one near the Sea.
11. The timeline for completion of the scope of services should be extended from 4 + 1 months to perhaps 6 + 2 months.	An additional 30 days has been added to the schedule for the draft report. All work under the Authority's grant must be completed by May 16, 2016 and time is needed to integrate this work into the Authority's final feasibility report. See response to Comment 6 below.
Comment Set 2	
1. Page 2, under Infrastructure Financing Feasibility Study Scope of Services, Supporting Deliverables; the Industry Forum event needs to be better defined, noting required minimum number of events, target audience of the event(s), purpose of the event, timing of this event within the report development process and anticipated location(s) (Coachella Valley, Imperial Valley or somewhere in between?) for the event(s). The scope and associated fee will vary greatly if the consultant will need to acquire a location and pay for its use if the intent is for a large gathering. In addition, the number of events required will be necessary to accurately scope and provide the associated fee.	See the response to the response to Comment 10 above. The Consultant can assume that rooms will be made available by the Authority at no charge.
2. Page 3, under both the Draft and Final Feasibility Report, the deliverables note PowerPoint and Workshop presentations. Once again, the RFP should note the number of expected presentations and at which events/meetings these presentations will be given.	The Consultant can assume one presentation for each, most likely at Salton Sea Authority Board meetings. The consultant should also assume that there will be a kickoff meeting and monthly status meetings or conference calls with Authority staff.
3. Under Instructions to Interested Consultants, second paragraph, first sentence, "Resumes of key personnel, project descriptions and cost proposal details may be included as attachments ..." Our opinion is that all of the noted items need to be included with the submittal in order for the Authority to make an informed decision on the most	The noted items should be included with the submittal and will be considered in the evaluation of Consultants. However, they will not be included in the ten page limit on the main proposal.

Comment	Response
<p>qualified consulting team. In addition, the last sentence notes Appendix A, which we assume is the included Attachment 1.</p>	
<p>4. The section titled Selection Criteria, denotes those areas where each consultant team's proposal will be judged, however there is no description as to the approach or criteria that will define the award of this contract, or better said what criteria is most important to the selection committee. We believe this Report is too important to be based on low-bid. Furthermore, the selection committee should judge all submitted proposals on Other Intangibles which the team brings to completion of this Benchmark. Additionally, [consultant] does not believe that the \$225,000 allocated for the Benchmark 5 portion of the work plan, as noted in the RFP, is a sufficient amount of funding to provide for a Report that will give a true indication of the potential real estate effects of a recreational lake associated with the restored Salton Sea.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Salton Sea Authority has received a grant of \$225,000 to conduct this study. No additional funds are available at this time. If the Consultant can bring other sources of funding to expand the project, that will be noted and considered in the evaluation process.</p>
<p>5. [Consultant] also believes that expertise within the Coachella and Imperial Valley local/regional area in the areas of real estate industry, land use planning concepts, economic forecasting and fiscal analysis should be a key element in the approach and selection of the preferred Consultant team. On page 3 paragraph 2 "Instructions...", Item 3 should include Coachella Valley, Imperial County and recreational lake projects added to the proposal requirement.</p>	<p>As indicated in Selection Criteria 2 and 3, special consideration for local relevant experience will be given in the evaluation of personnel qualifications and project experience, respectively.</p>
<p>6. The Timeline noted on page 4, allows for only 120 days to complete the Benchmark 5 Report. In our opinion, this duration of time is simply not enough to prepare the type of Report we envision to adequately address the underlying issue of whether an IFD will provide sufficient funding to provide for a recreational lake as a part of the Salton Sea restoration. Furthermore, as recognized by all those associated with the restoration efforts, this Report will be a fundamental element in the final selection of the preferred restoration option, recreation lake or not, and thus it should not be rushed through the process. We believe that this timeframe should be extended to a minimum of 8 months, and if that requires the Authority to ask for an extension from the State then that process should begin immediately.</p>	<p>Please see the response to Item 11 in Comment Set 1. The Authority may request an extension in the deadline for completion of the grant, but this cannot be counted on at this time. The Consultant may propose and alternate timeline, but this may result in assignment of a lower score. Any proposed timelines that extend beyond May 16, 2016 will be considered non-responsive.</p>